

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-92. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-92 *as originally filed over five years ago* in view of the following remarks.

Second Request for Interview

In response to the previous official action, Applicants respectfully requested a telephonic interview with the Examiner and the Examiner's supervisor if the Examiner continued to reject any of the present claims. However, although the Examiner did indeed reject all claims once again, the Examiner ignored Applicants' reasonable request despite Applicants' Job-like patience in waiting over four years to request their first interview. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit this second request for an interview with the Examiner and the Examiner's supervisor should the Examiner fail to allow all claims in view of the remarks set forth below. Furthermore, to remind the Examiner of the reasons Applicants requested an interview, Applicants repeat below the reasons set forth in the previous response for the Examiner's convenience.

Applicants respectfully note that M.P.E.P. 706 states that the "goal of examination is to clearly articulate any rejection early in the prosecution process so that the applicant has the opportunity to ... reply completely at the earliest opportunity" and that the Examiner "should never overlook the importance of his or her role in allowing claims which properly define the invention." Applicants further note that M.P.E.P. 707.02 states "supervisory patent examiners should impress their assistants with the fact that the shortest path to the final disposition of an application is by finding the best references on the first search and carefully applying them." Applicants respectfully point out that the original application was filed in 2001 and that the office action mailed on April 17, 2006, contained rejections based on prior art that had not been introduced in the previous five years of examination. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that the present rejections are no more on point than any of the previous rejections that have been successfully overcome. Therefore, based on the remarks below, Applicants

respectfully request withdrawal of all rejections and allowance of the present claims.

First Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-5, 7-14, 16-22, 24-34, 36-38, 40-47, 49-55, 57-67, 69-71, 73-80, 82-24, and 86-92 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Raff reference in view of the Liu reference. Specifically, the Examiner stated:

As per claim 1, Raff discloses method for managing a combination of family related matters and work-related matters, the method comprising the acts of collecting 'personal information related to a family manager's personal life and work information related to the family manager's work life at a host computer (Column 10 lines 1 1-52); communicating the personal information and the work information from the host computer to a first device dedicated to the family manager (Column 10 lines 11-52). Raff fails to distinctly point out communicating only personal information to one device and only work information to another device. However, Liu teaches communicating only the personal information from the host computer to at least one second device dedicated to at least one person in a personal sphere of the family manager (Figure 3B, Column 10 lines 35-54); and communicating only the work information from the host to at least one third device dedicated to at least one person in a work sphere of the family manager (Figure 3B, Column 10 lines 35-54). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the teaching of Liu with the method of Raff. Motivation to do so would have been to provide only the information a user wants to synchronize.

...

Claims 14,34,47,67,80, are individually similar in scope to that of claim 1, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Office Action, pages 3, 4 and 6.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. The burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness falls on the Examiner. *Ex parte Wolters and Kuypers*, 214 U.S.P.Q. 735 (PTO Bd. App. 1979). Obviousness cannot be established by combining the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention absent some teaching or suggestion supporting the combination. *ACS Hospital Systems, Inc. v.*

Montefiore Hospital, 732 F.2d 1572, 1577, 221 U.S.P.Q. 929, 933 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

Accordingly, to establish a *prima facie* case, the Examiner must not only show that the combination includes *all* of the claimed elements, but also a convincing line of reason as to why one of ordinary skill in the art would have found the claimed invention to have been obvious in light of the teachings of the references. *Ex parte Clapp*, 227 U.S.P.Q. 972 (B.P.A.I. 1985). When prior art references require a selected combination to render obvious a subsequent invention, there must be some reason for the combination other than the hindsight gained from the invention itself, i.e., something in the prior art as a whole must suggest the desirability, and thus the obviousness, of making the combination. *Uniroyal Inc. v. Rudkin-Wiley Corp.*, 837 F.2d 1044, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1434 (Fed. Cir. 1988). The motivation to combine references must be based on objective evidence of record and cannot be based on subjective belief and unknown authority. *In re Lee*, 277 F.3d 1338, 61 USPQ2d 1430, 1434 (Fed. Cir. 2002).

General Comments

As discussed in detail below, Applicants respectfully submit that the Liu reference does not overcome the deficiencies of the Raff references discussed in response to the previous action. Generally speaking, the present application is directed to methods for managing a person's family-related matters and work-related matters, while preventing the person's business associates from accessing the person's family-related matters and while preventing the person's family from accessing the person's work-related matters. In sharp contrast, the Raff references repeatedly discusses ways to synchronize and view "shared" scheduling information and never once mentions or suggests providing any restrictions whatsoever between family-related matters and work-related matters. Indeed, the Examiner has essentially admitted that the Raff reference

contains such deficiencies by withdrawing the previous rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) in view of Applicants' remarks set forth in the response to the previous official action.

The Examiner has attempted to cure the deficiencies of the Raff reference by combining its teachings with the teachings of the Liu reference. However, as discussed in further detail below, the Liu reference is solely directed to a method of synchronizing and updating information on two devices that contain dissimilar data sets or information fields. Hence, no reasonable person of ordinary skill in the art could possibly combine the teachings of the Raff reference with the teachings of the Liu reference to arrive at the subject matter set forth in any of the pending claims. Therefore, once again, Applicants strenuously request favorable consideration of the remarks set forth below, withdrawal of all outstanding rejections, and allowance of all pending claims.

Furthermore, while the Examiner's rejection is reasonably detailed with respect to certain claims, e.g., independent claim 1, the Examiner has made short shrift of most of the remaining claims, e.g., independent claims 14, 47, 67, and 80, by stating that they are "individually similar in scope to that of claim 1, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale." Applicants respectfully disagree that they are so similar in scope that they do not deserve an individual explanation of the manner in which the cited references apply to the subject matter of each claim. Consequently, Applicants will discuss the subject matter recited in each of the independent claims below to demonstrate why each claim distinguishes over the cited combination.

Independent Claims 1 and 14

As mentioned above, the present application is generally directed to methods for allowing a person to manage family-related matters and work-related matters, while keeping each of these types of matters protected from unauthorized access from a member of the opposite group. Specifically, the application discloses a method of utilizing a *barrier* to separate a family manager's personal information from the manager's work information. Application, page 15, lines 1-10; page 17, line 20 – page 18, line 6. The application also discloses a method for communication of family-related and work-related information from a host computer to a device *dedicated* to the family manager. Application, page 16, lines 5-10.

Accordingly, independent claims 1 and 14 recite a method for managing personal and work-related matters comprising “communicating *only the personal information* from the host computer to at least one second device dedicated to at least one person in a *personal sphere* of the family manager; and communicating *only the work information* from the host to at least one third device dedicated to at least one person in a *work sphere* of the family manager.”

(Emphasis added). Claims 1 and 14 further recite a method for managing personal and work-related matters comprising “collecting personal information related to a ... family manager's personal life and work information related to the ... family manager's work life at a [computer]; communicating the personal information and the work information ... from the [computer] to a first device dedicated to the ... family manager.”

In contrast, the Raff reference does not disclose a method which communicates only work information to work-related entities and only personal information to personal entities. Specifically, the reference provides a device which allows the user to choose which schedules are displayed *without restriction* as to whether the schedule is categorized as personal or work-

related. Raff, Fig. 18, item 615, Fig. 8, step 415, col. 10, line 64 – col. 11, line 6, col. 13 lines 16-20. In addition, the Raff reference uses the term “personal” to describe matters that pertain to the individual user which may be composed of both the individual’s work-related *and* family-related matters. Raff, Fig. 10A; col. 10, lines 31-33, 49-52. Accordingly, the Raff reference does not disclose a method that communicates only work information to work-related entities and only personal information to personal entities.

The Lui reference does nothing to obviate the deficiencies of the Raff reference. The Lui reference is solely concerned with addressing the problem of synchronizing two devices when the data fields in one device differ from the data field in another device. Lui, column 1, lines 53-60. Indeed, the entire discussion relating to the solution to this problem focuses on reconciling or synchronizing information stored in one device with the information present in another device where there is a need to translate or map data fields from one device to the other. See, e.g., Lui, column 2, lines 50-54. The Lui reference describes a rule-based methodology for matching data fields between different data sets in column 7, line 31, to column 11, line 10, and in reference to Fig. 5. Based on this description of the rule-based methodology for providing data field translation from one device to another, any reasonable person of ordinary skill in the art would, at most, conclude the techniques in the Raff reference could be improved by utilizing the translation methodology in the Lui reference. However, it is clear that such a modification has absolutely no impact on the presently claimed subject matter, since such a modification does not cure the deficiencies of the Raff reference discussed above.

Indeed, given the clear thrust of the Lui reference, it is shocking that the Examiner has misinterpreted the Lui reference so poorly in formulating the rejection of the present claims.

In regard to the Lui reference, the Examiner specifically stated:

Lui teaches communicating only the personal information from the host computer to at least one second device dedicated to at least one person in a personal sphere of the family manager (Fig. 3B, column 10, lines 35-54); and communicating only the work information from the host to at least one third device dedicated to at least one person in a work sphere of the family manager (Fig. 3B, column 10, lines 35-54).

Office Action, page 3.

In reality, the portion of the Lui reference relied upon by the Examiner follows an extensive listing of address rules used in the data mapping process, where the address rules are designed to handle address-type information, which are troublesome due to the seemingly endless number ways that one can represent address information. *See*, Lui, column 9, line 1, to column 10, line 34. With this context in mind, the portion of the Lui reference relied upon by the Examiner specifically states:

As shown, addressing information is divided into "home" and "work" types. Within those types, subtypes appear, such as a home city (hcity), home state (hsta), and home zip code (hzip). In this manner, the system can appropriately map address information into home and/or work address fields on a target device.

Although the foregoing example has focused on the currently preferred embodiment of mapping between multiple devices (e.g., PIMs running on PCs) to a single device (e.g., REX device), the methodology of the present invention can be modified to map between any arbitrary number of devices. This is illustrated by table 400 in FIG. 4. As shown, the table includes field mapping rules for three separate devices. Here, any device in the table can map to any other device in the table. The approach works better when synchronizing data between a number of PIMs, but provides less specificity for mapping data fields to a specific device. In an embodiment targeting

mapping to a single device, therefore, the linear or single mapping approach (previously described) is preferred.

Lui, column 10, lines 35-54.

As can be readily seen from even a cursory review of the portion of the Lui reference relied upon by the Examiner, the Lui reference does not teach communicating only the personal information from a host computer to a second device dedicated to a person in the personal sphere of the family manager and communicating only the work information from the host to a third device dedicated to a person in the work sphere of the family manager. To the contrary, this portion of the Lui reference merely teaches applying the address rules to map fields amongst three devices labeled “Outlook 97,” “Schedule” and “REX” as set forth in Fig. 4. The Lui reference provides absolutely no suggestion whatsoever to communicate only personal information to one device and only work information to another device, nor does the Lui reference provide any suggestion relating to dedication of certain devices to certain users or any restrictions that may flow therefrom.

In view of the remarks set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that the subject matter of independent claims 1 and 14, as well as all claims that depend therefrom, is not rendered obvious by any reasonable combination of the Raff reference with the Lui reference. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of these claims.

Independent Claim 67

The present application also discloses a “barrier” that is implemented to ensure that specific personal information is not accessible to work-related entities and that work-related

information is not accessible to personal entities. Application, page 17, line 20 to page 18, line 1. Referring to independent claim 67, it recites “maintaining a barrier between the personal information and the work information,” “collecting personal information related to a family manager’s personal life and work information related to the family manager’s work life at a host computer ... communicating the personal information and the work information from the host computer only to a first device dedicated to the family manager” and “communicating *only the personal information* from the host computer to at least one second device dedicated to at least one person in a *personal sphere* of the family manager; and communicating *only the work information* from the host to at least one third device dedicated to at least one person in a *work sphere* of the family manager.” (Emphasis added).

In contrast, the Raff reference does not describe a method where a barrier is maintained between personal and work related information, restricting the access to work or personal information based on the status of the contact viewing the information. Instead, the Raff reference describes a device which allows a user to choose which schedules are displayed *without restriction* as to whether the schedule is categorized as personal or work-related. Raff, Fig. 18, item 615; Fig. 8, step 415; col. 10, line 64 – col. 11, line 6; col. 13 lines 16-20. Accordingly, Raff does not disclose a method of using a barrier between personal and work information to restrict access based on the entity’s status.

The Lui reference does not cure this deficiency. Indeed, as discussed above, the Lui reference merely provides a methodology for translating information from one type of data set to another type of data set in order to synchronize the information between two dissimilar devices. The Lui reference does not disclose or suggest maintaining any type of barrier, restriction or privacy between work-related and family-related information as set forth in

independent claim 67. Therefore, the device disclosed in the Raff reference could not be modified based on the teachings of the Lui reference to yield the subject matter set forth in claim 67.

In view of the remarks set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that the subject matter of independent claim 67, as well as all claims that depend therefrom, is not rendered obvious by any reasonable combination of the Raff reference with the Lui reference. Therefore, Applicants respect withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of these claims.

Independent Claim 80

Independent claim 80 recites a method for maintaining a barrier between personal information associated with a first device and work information associated with a second device, while providing all such information to a third device dedicated to a family manager. Specifically, independent claim 80 recites “communicating personal information ... from at least one first device to a host computer,” “communicating work information ... from at least one second device to a host computer,” “forming a barrier between the personal information and the work information,” “communicating the personal information and the work information ... only to a third device dedicated to the family manager,” “communicating only the personal information ... to the first device,” and “communicating only the work information ... to the second device.”

Clearly, in view of the discussion above, no reasonable combination of the teachings of the Raff reference and the Lui reference can possibly yield the method set forth in independent claim 80. Neither reference discloses or suggests building a barrier between a family manager’s personal information and work-related information that is loaded onto a

host computer via a first device and a second device, respectively; neither reference discloses or suggests communicating both types of information to a third device dedicated to the family manager; and neither reference discloses or suggests communicating only the personal information to the first device and communicating only the work information to the second device. Consequently, the subject matter set forth in independent claim 80 cannot be found to be obvious in view of any combination of the Raff reference with the Lui reference.

In view of the remarks set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that the subject matter of independent claim 80, as well as the subject matter of all claims that depend therefrom, is not rendered obvious by any reasonable combination of the Raff reference with the Lui reference. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of these claims.

Independent claims 34 and 47

In the present application, one embodiment relates to utilizing a host computer to gather information from family entities and from work entities and to provide such information to the family manager, such as in the form of a merged family/work calendar only available to the family manager. *See, e.g.*, Application, Fig. 1. Accordingly, claim 34 recites a method comprising “communicating personal information related to a family manager’s personal life from at least one first device to a host computer; communicating work information related to the family manager’s work life from at least one second device to the host computer; and communicating the personal information and the work information related to the family manager from the host computer to a third device dedicated to the family manager.” Another embodiment relates to a situation involving multiple family managers, where the family managers share each other’s personal information, but where the work-related information for

each family manager remains segregated. Claim 47 is directed to such a situation, where personal and work information from a first and second device are communicated to a third device dedicated to a first family manager, where personal and work information from a fourth and fifth device are communicated to a sixth device are dedicated to a second family manager, where personal information related to the first family manager is communicated to the sixth device of the second family manager, and where personal information related to the second family manager is communicated to the third device dedicated to the first family manager.

As discussed above, neither the Raff reference nor the Lui reference provides any discussion of a family manager or of any device dedicated to a family manager. In addition, neither the Raff reference nor the Lui reference provides any discussion of the manner in which personal information from the device of a personal entity and work-related information from the device of a work entity can be shared with the family manager. Furthermore, given the fact that neither of the cited references even mentions a single family manager or the manner in which personal and work-related information may be shared, it seems abundantly clear that neither of the cited references could possibly be construed to teach or suggest a situation involving multiple family managers and the manner in which they can share each other's personal information while maintaining a barrier between each other's work-related information. Accordingly, the subject matter of independent claims 34 and 47 cannot be considered obvious in view of any combination of the Raff reference with the Lui reference.

In view of the remarks set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that the subject matter of independent claims 34 and 47, as well as all claims that depend therefrom, is not rendered obvious by any reasonable combination of the Raff reference with the Lui reference.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of these claims.

Second Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 2, 6, 15, 23, 35, 39, 48, 56, 68, 72, 81, and 85 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Raff reference and Liu reference in view of the Edwards reference. Specifically, the Examiner stated:

As per claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Raff-Liu fails to specifically point out a private host computer. However, Edwards teaches a method, wherein the host computer comprises a private host computer ([0010]-[0012]). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the private computer of Edwards with the method of Raff-Liu. Motivation to do so would have been to provide a secure way of accessing applications, programs, and capabilities of the device.

As per claim 6, which is dependent on claim 1, Raff-Liu-Edwards teaches a method wherein the devices comprise e-mail capability (Edwards, [0010] lines 1 - 15).

Claims 15, 35, 48, 68, 81 are individually similar in scope to that of claim 2, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 23, 39, 56, 72, 85 are individually similar in scope to that of claim 6, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Office Action, pages 8 and 9.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. As discussed in the response to the previous official action, the Examiner has not provided a sufficient suggestion to support the combination of the Edwards reference with the Raff reference. Applicants further submit that, similarly, there is no motivation to support the combination of the Edwards reference with the Raff-Liu combination. The Edwards reference pertains to providing access to a

private network to increase security, where as the Raff reference discloses a system for sharing, viewing, and synchronizing multiple schedules. The Lui reference merely provides a particular methodology for performing such a synchronization where the devices to be synchronized include differing data sets. Thus, the combination of the Raff-Lui references actually teaches away from using a private network that would greatly reduce, or eliminate, the type of sharing disclosed by the Raff reference. As such, the Edwards reference does not cure the deficiencies of the Raff-Lui references discussed above with regard to the various independent claims from which the presently rejected claims depend. Therefore, the present combination cannot render obvious the subject matter of the presently rejected claims.


In view of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the subject matter of the presently rejected claims distinguishes over the Raff, Lui, and Edwards references. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of these claims.

Conclusion

The present application has been pending since December 21, 2001, i.e., a period of over five years. During that time, the USPTO has had ample opportunity to fully consider the claimed subject matter and to perform all appropriate searches to determine whether Applicants are entitled to the claimed subject matter. During this extensive and prolonged period of examination, no prior art has been found that discloses or fairly suggests the subject matter set forth in Applicants' originally filed claims. Hence, Applicants once again respectfully request withdrawal of all outstanding rejections and allowance of all claims at the earliest possible opportunity.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 16, 2007



Michael G. Fletcher
Reg. No. 32,777
(281) 970-4545

Correspondence Address:

Hewlett-Packard Company
IP Administration
Legal Department, M/S 35
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400